DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 088 530 IR 000 372

AUTHOR	Lange, Carl J.; And Others
TITLE	Films and Group Discussions as a Means of Training Leaders.
INSTITUTION	George Washington Univ., Alexandria, Va. Human Resources Research Office.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of the Chief of Research and Development (Army), Washington, D.C.
REPORT NO	HumRRO-TR-27
PUB DATE	Mar 56
NOTE	44p.; Prepared by Human Research Unit Nr 2, CONARC, Fort Ord, Calif.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.75 HC-$1.85
DESCRIPTORS	*Discussion (Teaching Technique); *Discussion Groups; Discussion Programs; Educational Research; *Instructional Films; *Leadership Training; Military Science; Military Training; Officer Personnel; *Problem Solving; Sound Films

ABSTRACT

Research sought to develop and evaluate a sound film-discussion technique for training junior officers in military leadership. The modified course aimed to give students the opportunity to solve realistic problems. Ten films were produced depicting typical problems officers encounter and classes receiving training were divided into small groups to discuss problems immediately after viewing the film. A representative of each group then participated in a panel discussion before the entire class. Both students and instructors had positive attitudes toward the new technique. Students' comments reflected a broadening of their points of view in dealing with leadership problems and they gained experience in analyzing problems and showed increased confidence in their judgement. Students who received the special training showed greater improvement in the quality of their solutions to leadership problems than did students who underwent regular training; furthermore, students from the experimental classes were also better judges of who the best leaders in the class were. It was concluded that the use of the sound film-discussion technique would improve present leadership training. (Author/LB)

ED 088530

HumRRO
Technical Report 27 March 1956

IR

Films and Group Discussions as a Means of Training Leaders

by

Carl J. Lange, Carl H. Rittenhouse,
and Richard C. Atkinson

Human Research Unit Nr 2, CONARC
Fort Ord, California

Under the Technical Supervision of

The George Washington University
HUMAN RESOURCES RESEARCH OFFICE
operating under contract with
THE DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

IR 000 372

ED 088530

FILMS AND GROUP DISCUSSIONS AS A MEANS OF TRAINING LEADERS

by

Carl J. Lange, Carl H. Rittenhouse, and Richard C. Atkinson

Approved:

Francis H. Palmer
FRANCIS H. PALMER
Director of Research
Human Research Unit Nr 2, CONARC
Fort Ord, California

Patrick D. Mulcahy
PATRICK D. MULCAHY
Col, Inf, Chief
Human Research Unit Nr 2, CONARC
Fort Ord, California

Meredith P. Crawford
MEREDITH P. CRAWFORD
Director
Human Resources Research Office

The George Washington University
HUMAN RESOURCES RESEARCH OFFICE
operating under contract with
THE DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

Technical Report 27
March 1956

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Copy _____
Task OFFTRAIN I

COMPOSITION OF RESEARCH TEAM

Richard C. Atkinson
Stanley B. Bensen
Richard Bruner
Carl J. Lange
Gilbert L. Neal
Carl H. Rittenhouse

The contents of HumRRO publications, including the conclusions and recommendations, should not be considered as having official Department of the Army approval, either expressed or implied.

Published
March 1956
by
The George Washington University
HUMAN RESOURCES RESEARCH OFFICE
Post Office Box 3596
Washington 7, D. C.

Distributed under the authority of the
Chief of Research and Development
Department of the Army
Washington 25, D. C.

BRIEF

This research was conducted to develop and experimentally evaluate a sound film–discussion technique for training junior officers in military leadership. The aims of the modified course were (1) to increase the realism of the leadership problems presented to students, and (2) to provide each student with maximum opportunity to participate in solving problems.

Ten films depicting officer problems were produced. Based on descriptions of leadership problem situations collected from junior officers and NCO's, and on data from studies of leadership in Korea, the films were typical of problems young officers encounter. Classes receiving the training were divided into small groups which discussed each problem immediately after the film was shown. A representative from each group then participated in a panel discussion before the entire class.

Army instructors at The Artillery School at Fort Sill used the course for the leadership training of two OCS classes and one OBC class. Evaluations of the training were obtained from students and instructors. In addition, several measures of the effect of the training were obtained from the specially trained groups, and the results were compared with the same types of measures taken from groups trained the conventional way.

The reactions of both students and instructors were favorable. Especially encouraging were the students' comments which reflected a broadening of their point of view in dealing with leadership problems. They gained experience in analyzing problems and expressed the feeling of gaining confidence in their judgment.

The students who received the special training showed greater improvement in the quality of their solutions to leadership problems than did students who received the regular training. At the end of training, students in the experimental classes were also better judges of who the top leaders in their class were.

The results of the study indicated that incorporation of the sound film–discussion technique would improve present leadership training.

CONTENTS

Page

Brief iii

Part I

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The Military Problem 3
The Research Problem 3
Findings 4
Conclusions and Implications 6

Part II

DESCRIPTION OF THE RESEARCH

The Problem 9
Development of Training Materials 10
Film Production 10
Discussion Techniques 10
Development of Manual 11
Procedure 12
Experimental Design 12
Samples 13
Instructor Training 13
Evaluation Instruments 14
Statement of Results 15
Student Evaluation of Course 15
Instructors' Evaluation of Course 17
Officer Leadership Questionnaire 17
Ideal Officer Form 19
Student Judgment Form 21
Summary 22

Bibliography 25

APPENDICES

Appendix		Page
A	Descriptions of Leadership Problems Used in the Experimental Course	26
B	Description of Evaluation Instruments	33

TABLES

Table		
1	Age, Education, and Military Experience of OBC and OCS Classes	13
2	Students in Each Class Who Were Favorable Toward Various Training Techniques	15
3	Means for Questions One Through Six on Officer Leadership Questionnaire	18
4	Analysis of Variance of Initiating Structure Scores	20
5	Means of Initiating Structure Scores	20
6	Means of Consideration Scores	20
7	Analysis of Variance of Consideration Scores	20
8	Means of Agreement Difference Scores	21
9	Analysis of Variance of Agreement Difference Scores	22

FILMS AND GROUP DISCUSSIONS AS A MEANS OF TRAINING LEADERS

PART I
SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

THE MILITARY PROBLEM

The young officer's skill in dealing with superiors, subordinates, and peers is an important determiner of success in his early assignments. As a leader, he must infuse his men with an attitude of willing acceptance of responsibility for contributing to the accomplishment of the unit's mission. He must work effectively with other officers at his level, and he must establish relationships with his superiors that enable him to preserve loyalty to his men and his superiors.

What does an officer need to learn in order to do these things? He must learn to recognize leadership problems. He must learn how to judge and evaluate the motivations of those individuals involved in the problem. He must learn to analyze this information in relationship to goals of the unit. He must learn to make decisions and carry them out in a way that will develop a positive, constructive attitude in his men and lead to the achievement of the mission.

Present leadership training for junior officers includes teaching 11 principles of leadership and the traits of the leader, and analyzing examples of leadership problems in terms of leadership principles. As experienced officers well know, broad principles of leadership alone do not provide specific solutions to problems. Leadership principles can be no more than a guide, defining an ideal criterion of leadership performance. The principles are abstract; in a given situation, a wide variety of actions can be taken, all of which can be defended to varying degrees by resort to some one of these principles. In many situations several leadership principles involved may conflict, and a choice regarding emphasis must be made.

How can leadership training be modified to give the junior officer maximum opportunity to learn the skills involved in solving leadership problems and in maintaining good relationships with superiors, peers, and subordinates?

THE RESEARCH PROBLEM

This research was conducted to develop and experimentally evaluate a course in leadership for junior officers. Designed to give the student maximum opportunity to practice solving realistic leadership problems in a training situation where he could get frank, constructive criticism and hear the solutions that others proposed, the course made use of sound films to present problems in a way that closely resembled real-life situations. Small group discussions were used to give each student an opportunity to participate actively in analyzing and solving the problems. Following these discussions, representatives of each of the small groups met in front of the class and discussed the various proposed solutions.

The classes were divided into several small groups, ranging in size from 6 to 10 students, immediately following the showing of a filmed problem. Discussions in these groups lasted from 10 to 15 minutes, after which each group selected one of its members to describe the group's point of view before the full class; in some classes, leaders of the groups had been named by the instructor prior to the discussion. In the panel discussion which followed, the solutions proposed by the various small groups were presented before the entire class, and every student was afforded an opportunity to take part.

Ten films depicting officer problems were produced. Based on descriptions of leadership problem situations collected from junior officers and NCO's and on data from studies of leadership in Korea, they were characteristic of problems young officers encounter. Each film lasted from 5 to 10 minutes. An additional eight problems were used which were presented in written form. A manual for instructors was prepared which described the discussion techniques to be used and included descriptions of the filmed problems.

Army instructors in The Artillery School at Fort Sill used the course for the leadership training of two Officer Candidate School classes and one Officer Basic Course class. Two OCS classes and one OBC class receiving the regular leadership training were tested with the same instruments used to test the experimental classes, and the effects of the two types of training were compared. Evaluations of the experimental training were obtained from students who received the training and from the instructors who gave it.

FINDINGS

The modified course was designed to create a highly interesting training situation for the students and to give them experience in solving problems in a situation where they would gain confidence in their ability to solve such problems, and insight into the points of view of others. To appraise the extent to which this was done, a questionnaire was used to obtain comments from both students and instructors concerning the films, the small group discussions, and the panel discussion. The comments were generally favorable. An analysis of over-all ratings of students' comments about the course based on the questionnaire responses revealed that more than 90 per cent reacted favorably to the films, 87 per cent to the small group discussion, and 67 per cent to the panel discussion. More than 80 per cent reacted favorably to the entire course.

The aspect of the films which the students mentioned most frequently as an advantage was the realistic manner in which important details of each problem, such as attitudes and expressed feelings of characters, were shown. A good proportion of the students also liked the way the films showed the development of the situation, which allowed them to see how the problem could have been avoided. Some of the comments were:

> A very good method of presentation. It gives the student the feeling of being in the position himself and makes everything more realistic.
>
> One of the best methods of helping a person get a good idea of the problems he will have to face as an officer. You see the problem develop and it is more real to life.

You are able to see actual speeches and expressions that could not be conveyed by words alone.

Best way—quick and leaves less room for misinterpretation than written problems do.

This method brought the problem much closer to us and allowed us to see facial expressions, reactions, and relationships among the men.

The comments concerning the small group discussion and the panel discussion emphasized several advantages which seem to be important ones. Especially encouraging were the students' comments which reflected a broadening of their point of view in dealing with leadership problems. They recognized from their experiences in this training that there are usually several acceptable approaches to such problems. They gained experience in analyzing problems and expressed the feeling of gaining confidence in their judgment. The informality of the sessions encouraged all students to participate. Some excerpts from their comments follow:

The discussions were quite beneficial.

They provide a very important part of the course, the opportunity to exchange ideas and be exposed to new approaches. Many times a person could see an error in his immediate solution by listening to someone else.

They allow for every individual to give his opinion.

The students with less experience learn from those who have had more experience.

Comments of the students about the over-all course suggested that the training increased their awareness of this type of problem, provided a broader point of view by showing them how others consider the problems, gave them an opportunity to gain experience with problems similar to those they will meet on the job, showed how the problems can be solved in a constructive manner, and allowed the student to gain confidence and skill in his judgment.

Perhaps one of the most important results of the training, according to their statements, is that they learned to recognize more easily the existence of problems. Without the training they might fail to notice such problems, allowing them to accumulate and develop into major sources of tension and unrest. Some of the comments about the entire course were:

It has given me a keen insight into leadership problems. It seems I have almost lived some problems that otherwise may have taken several years to experience.

I have developed a much broader viewpoint.

I have been in the service for quite some time and have been faced with many problems similar to ones in the films. If I am confronted with such problems in the future, solving them will not be as difficult.

This is one of the best types of leadership courses that I have had the opportunity to attend.

There are many things I did not know about working with NCO's before receiving this training.

I will be better qualified to deal with NCO's and EM's.

Criticisms of the training included flaws in the films and shortcomings of the discussion techniques which can be eliminated by minor modifications

in the course. Suggestions stemming from the comments for improvement of the training included:

(1) Act out solutions to some of the problems;
(2) Include an introductory period on principles of leadership;
(3) Include more problems;
(4) Allow opportunity to solve problems individually as well as in groups;
(5) Use films to present all problems.

The instructors' comments closely paralleled those made by the students. In addition to general evaluative comments, detailed suggestions for modifications of the films and procedures were obtained. These have been incorporated in the revised manual for instructors. The instructors were in favor of using this type of leadership training in conjunction with several hours of training on principles of leadership. They suggested that a total of 10 to 12 hours be devoted to leadership training. They also suggested that all problems be presented with films.

In addition to the opinion polling of the students and instructors, a battery of tests and questionnaires was administered before and after training to both the specially trained classes and the classes receiving conventional training. This battery included an Officer Leadership Questionnaire, an Ideal Officer Questionnaire, and a Student Judgment Form.

The analysis of the data obtained with this battery consistently supported the hypothesis that the experimental training was superior to the conventional training. Specifically, the following conclusions can be drawn from this analysis:

(1) The quality of solutions to leadership problems for the experimental group was superior to that of the group receiving regular training.

(2) The experimental group was superior to the regular group in their ability to select good leaders. Further, it was found that the poorest judges showed the greatest improvement with training.

CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

The students in the modified leadership training course showed significant improvement over students conventionally trained in their ability to (1) analyze and present solutions to leadership problems and (2) select good leaders.

This evidence, in conjunction with the students' and instructors' highly favorable comments toward the modified course, suggests that consideration should be given to incorporating this type of training in the leadership courses of schools which train junior officers. From 10 to 12 hours should be devoted to this type of training, allotting 2 to 3 hours to the teaching of principles and the remaining time to discussion of leadership problems presented by sound films.

PART II
DESCRIPTION OF THE RESEARCH

THE PROBLEM

This research was conducted to develop and experimentally evaluate a sound film–discussion technique for training junior officers in military leadership. The junior officer's skill in establishing and maintaining good relationships with and among superiors, subordinates, and associates is an important determiner of his success. Such relationships maximize the contribution of the officer and his unit to the effective functioning of the Army.

To deal with leadership problems effectively, the young officer must learn to recognize the important factors in each problem situation and evaluate them in terms of their relationship to the achievement of both the immediate and the long-range mission of his unit. The purpose of the modified course in leadership studied in this research was to give junior officers experience in solving leadership problems typical of those with which they are likely to deal during the early years of their military careers.

The officer in real-life situations is not often in a position to get evaluations of his leadership performance from those he is leading. He rarely receives open and frank criticism of his leadership acts, nor does he have very much opportunity to learn about the attitudes and views of other officers. With these considerations in mind, this course was designed to give the student an opportunity to learn about his own strengths and weaknesses through participating in the solution of leadership problems in a training situation where he could get frank, constructive criticism of his proposed solutions from others and hear the solutions that others proposed for the same problems.

Sound films were used to present leadership problems realistically.[1] Small group discussions and panel discussions were used in conjunction with the sound films to maximize student participation in the training.

Two Officer Candidate School classes and one Officer Basic Course class in The Artillery School at Fort Sill, Okla., received training with the new techniques, which were used in place of the conventional techniques. Evaluations of the training were obtained from both the students who received it and the instructors who conducted it. Several measures of the effect of the training were obtained from the specially trained groups, and the results were compared with those from the same measures taken from the groups that received the conventional leadership training.

[1]Launor F. Carter produced several films in the summer of 1951 at the University of Rochester for use in a human relations course. The films showed human relations problems to the point of conflict between characters involved in the situation. From this work came the idea of developing the type of films produced in this study.

DEVELOPMENT OF TRAINING MATERIALS

Film Production

The sound motion picture is a particularly appropriate medium for presenting leadership problems to a class. It has several advantages over other methods such as oral or written descriptions of problems. In a few minutes a complete problem situation can be portrayed in detail. The characteristics of the individuals involved can be observed by the student as they could be observed in the actual situation. The personality factors, attitudes, feelings, and expressions which should be taken into consideration in solving leadership problems can be portrayed accurately and fully. The realism of such presentations increases the student's interest; the problems seem much more like real-life situations than do written or oral descriptions of problems.

Several criteria were used in producing the sound films. They were to be short—5 to 10 minutes—and were to present leadership problems characteristic of those confronting junior officers. They were to be terminated at the point where the leader is faced with making a decision and taking action to deal with the situation.

Ten films depicting officer problems were produced at Fort Ord by the research staff. Actors were supplied by Special Services. Scripts for the films, prepared by the researchers, were based on descriptions of leadership problem situations collected from battery officers and NCO's at Fort Sill, and on data from studies of squad leadership in Korea. They were reviewed by several experienced Army officers who judged the problems presented to be important and characteristic of those young officers encounter. The script of one problem and narrative descriptions of the remaining nine filmed problems are reproduced in Appendix A.

An additional eight problems were used which were presented in written form.

Discussion Techniques

The discussion techniques used in this training were modeled after techniques that have been used in industry for training supervisors and for increasing the participation of members at large meetings.[1]

A small group discussion followed the presentation of each film. The class was divided into several small groups ranging in size from 6 to 10 students. The students were told to place themselves in the position of the leader faced with the situation, and solve it as they would if they were in a similar position. They were directed to talk about the following:

(1) Factors to be considered in dealing with the problem;
(2) Possible solutions to the problem;
(3) Probable effect of various solutions on the immediate situation and on the long-range effectiveness of the group;
(4) Things the officer might have done to prevent the development of the problem.

[1] See references 1, 2, 3, 7, 8, 9.

It was further explained that the factors to be considered in dealing with the problem might include:

(1) Military regulations involved which might set limitations on the action which could be taken;
(2) The long-range mission of the group;
(3) The immediate mission of the group;
(4) The personalities and motivations of individuals involved in the situation;
(5) The personality of the leader himself.

The individual was told that throughout the course he should pay particular attention to his own strengths and weaknesses in working out solutions to the problems and should make an effort to identify the best way he could act as a leader.

After a discussion lasting from 10 to 15 minutes, each group selected one of its members to present the group's point of view before the entire class. In some classes, leaders of the groups were named by the instructor prior to the discussion.

In a panel discussion which followed immediately after the small group discussions, the solutions proposed by the various small groups were presented by the group representatives before the entire class. All aspects of the problem were discussed. It was believed that such a discussion should have high interest value for all members of the class because they had had an opportunity to participate in the formulation of the solutions discussed. As the panel discussion developed, members of the class other than group representatives on the panel were brought into the discussion.

Development of Manual

A manual for instructors was prepared in two sections, (1) a description of the purpose of the course, the techniques used, and the function of the instructor, and (2) narrative descriptions of the leadership problems and information concerning these problems as a guide for the instructor. This information included points to be considered in dealing with the problem, and possible solutions to the problem.

The description of the function of the instructor stressed that, aside from his initial statement giving the purpose of the training and the nature of the techniques to be used, his role was to be a passive one. He could be called upon as an expert in matters of military regulations, procedures, or practices, but not to provide solutions to the problems. During the panel discussion, he was to keep the discussion moving and to prevent its being sidetracked on irrelevant issues. At the end of the class discussion, he was to summarize the content of the discussion and, when necessary, criticize.

A subsection on "Material to be Presented During the Initial Hour of Training" provided the instructor with a standard introduction to be used in structuring the course.

A first draft of the manual was reviewed by instructors in the Department of Tactics and Combined Arms, The Artillery School and by the Artillery OCS Commandant and members of his staff. Their suggestions were incorporated in a revised manual prepared for use in the study. Following the

completion of the training, the instructors' comments and suggestions based on extended experience with the manual were obtained in a conference and a final revision was made.[1]

PROCEDURE

Experimental Design

Two Artillery OCS classes and one Officer Basic Course class received the experimental leadership training. Two other OCS classes and one OBC class which received the regular leadership training were used as control groups.

The original plan was to give the experimental training to half of each class included in the study. This would have made possible a simple randomized design with replications to control for possible class differences. However, administrative considerations (number of available instructors and scheduling problems), and the possible effects of having half the class aware that the other half was receiving more hours of training, led to the adoption of the design used. It should be pointed out that there is no reason to believe (1) that systematic factors existed which determined the assignment of students to classes or (2) that differential procedures were employed, except for leadership training, which would lead to differences between experimental and control conditions.

The following schedule of training was set up for the experiment:

CLASS	DATES OF TRAINING
OBC 101 (Control)	3 Nov 54 - 23 Nov 54
OBC 103 (Experimental)	18 Nov 54 - 5 Jan 55
OCS 60 (Experimental)	17 Nov 54 - 4 Jan 55
OCS 61 (Control)	17 Jan 55 - 1 Feb 55
OCS 62 (Experimental)	24 Jan 55 - 1 Mar 55
OCS 63 (Control)	14 Mar 55 - 29 Mar 55

The OCS classes receiving experimental training began the leadership training during the 15th week of the 22-week course. The OCS classes receiving the regular instruction began their leadership training during the 18th week of the course. The OBC experimental class began in the 10th week of its 16-week course, the regular OBC class during the 11th week. The experimental training extended over a period of five weeks in OCS and OBC; the regular leadership training extended over a period of two weeks for OCS, three weeks for OBC.

The same six instructors—one major and five captains—taught both the control and the experimental classes. No one instructor taught the same hours of instruction for all classes nor was any one instructor assigned to teach all hours of training for a particular class. Rather, the assignment depended on the availability of instructors and the scheduling demands of other courses. Consequently there was no strictly random or systematic assignment to

[1]Both the manual used for the experimental training course and the final revised version are available and can be obtained by writing to The Director's Office, Human Resources Research Office.

classes or hours of instruction; so far as was known, however, possible difference in the skills of instructors exercised no systematic bias on the effect of the training.

The size of the training sessions varied. The classes receiving experimental training were separated into two sections in OCS, and three sections in OBC; the classes receiving regular training were not separated into sections. The OCS experimental training groups each contained approximately 25 students. The two classes receiving the regular training included 43 and 71 students, respectively. The OBC experimental class sections had approximately 45 students each, the control class 124 students.

The regular leadership training included lectures on the principles of leadership, the traits of leaders, and techniques of leadership. Several hours were also spent in class discussion of leadership problems which were presented to the class in mimeographed form.

Samples

The OBC classes and the OCS classes differ in several important ways. The OBC students are almost entirely ROTC officers; they have on the average several years more education than the OCS students, but they have less military experience—only six students in the two OBC classes had active military experience. The mean ages of all classes were approximately equal. The mean age and years of education and the active military experience of the classes are presented in Table 1.

Table 1

AGE, EDUCATION, AND MILITARY EXPERIENCE OF OBC AND OCS CLASSES

Class		Years of Education (Mean)	Months of Active Military Experience (Median)	Age (Mean)
OBC	101	16	(ROTC)	22.4
	103	16	(ROTC)	22.5
OCS	60	14	9	22.7
	61	14	14	22.9
	62	14	9	22.2
	63	14	10	22.8

Instructor Training

Several training sessions were held with the instructors. These sessions included conferences during which the training techniques were discussed and the specific problems were reviewed, and a rehearsal in which the instructors played the roles of students except for one who acted as instructor for the group. As the rehearsal session developed, it was demonstrated how weaknesses in proposed solutions are brought out by group discussion and how improved solutions can be developed by the class members. A critique of the

rehearsal session and of early training sessions completed the training of the instructors.

During the experimental training a new instructor was assigned to the Department. His training included reading the manual and being briefed by several of the experienced instructors. With this background he did an excellent job.

Evaluation Instruments

The instruments employed in the study are described briefly here and presented in full in Appendix B. The student and instructor evaluations of the course were completed at the end of the training. All other forms and questionnaires were filled out at both the beginning and the end of the course.

Student Evaluation of Course

The revised training was designed to create a highly interesting training situation for the students and to give them experience in solving problems in a situation where they would gain confidence in their ability to solve such problems and insight into the points of view of others. To appraise the extent to which this was accomplished, a questionnaire was prepared to obtain their reactions to the training. The students were asked for their comments concerning the advantages and disadvantages of each of the techniques used—sound films of problems, small group discussions, and panel discussions—and for a description of the ways in which the training would help them.

Instructor Evaluation of Course

Similar data were collected from each of the instructors, except that they were asked to suggest specific ways in which the training could be improved.

Officer Leadership Questionnaire

A leadership questionnaire was developed to assess the change in quality of solutions to leadership problems. Two forms of the questionnaire were prepared. The rank order form presented 10 different leadership problems with five possible alternative solutions. The student was asked to rank the solutions in order of his preference and also to indicate those responses which he considered acceptable.

The free answer form of this questionnaire presented the same 10 leadership problems, but no solutions were provided. Instead, the student was asked to write a solution for each problem, including a discussion of factors considered and probable effects of the solution.

Ideal Officer Questionnaire

The Hemphill Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire[1] was used to get descriptions from the students of how they believed the ideal officer

[1]See references 4, 5, 6.

should behave. This questionnaire is ordinarily used to obtain descriptions of leaders from peers, superiors, or subordinates; for this study, the directions were modified to ask the respondent to indicate those responses which best describe the behavior of the ideal Army officer. The modified questionnaire was used to assess possible changes in students' attitudes toward those leader behaviors which were included in the questionnaire.

Student Judgment Form

Each student listed the top 10 leaders in the class, using the Student Judgment Form. It was hypothesized that the experimental training would increase the students' ability to recognize leadership ability in others. The criterion of leadership used was the final OCS class standings, which are based on evaluations of performance throughout the entire training course and provide the best available information on the students' leadership qualities. The average of the ranks, according to final class standing, of the 10 students nominated by each student constituted the measure of his ability to select leaders.

STATEMENT OF RESULTS

Student Evaluation of Course

An over-all rating of each student's attitude toward each of the various techniques used in the training was made on the basis of his responses on the student evaluation questionnaire. A rating of "favorable" was made when the responses concerning a particular technique listed advantages, and listed disadvantages which either contained suggestions for minor modifications in the technique or could be eliminated by minor modifications. A rating of "unfavorable" was made when the responses listed disadvantages which would require major modifications or which could not be eliminated even by major modifications.

These results are tabulated in Table 2. As can be seen, reactions to all aspects of the training were generally favorable. The panel discussion technique received the highest number of unfavorable comments, but even here the favorable responses were in the majority.

Table 2

STUDENTS IN EACH CLASS WHO WERE
FAVORABLE TOWARD VARIOUS TRAINING TECHNIQUES

Class	Number	Films (%)	Small Group Discussion (%)	Panel Discussion (%)
OBC 103	93	83	74	60
OCS 60	49	100	100	71
OCS 62	45	95	100	77

Tne content of the responses concerning each training technique were also analyzed. The results of this analysis are summarized in the following paragraphs.

The first question concerned the advantages and disadvantages of the sound films. Students reported that their interest and involvement was increased by the realistic portrayal of the leadership problems provided by the films; the showing of important details such as attitudes and expressed feelings of characters in the problem was considered an advantage. So was the fact that the films showed the development of the problem and allowed the student to see how it could have been avoided. The students considered the comprehensive portrayal of the problem in a short time an efficient method.

There were several criticisms of the films. Some men indicated that the films did not provide enough background information or enough of the situation to make the problem clear. In some instances, this lack of clarity about the nature of the problem is defensible because it is part of the leader's job to recognize and define the problem. In other cases, however, background features of the problem do need clarification. This will be accomplished by providing a short introductory paragraph in the manual for each film, to be read to the class by the instructor before the film is shown. Several other faults, such as the use of the same actors in different problems and technical flaws, can be remedied in remaking the films. The frequency of these responses was low.

The comments concerning the small group discussion technique emphasized several advantages which seem to be important. Each student had an opportunity to express his opinion, to criticize the opinion of others, and to receive criticism of his own opinions. The variety of opinions expressed and the opportunity to criticize and be criticized gave the student a clearer understanding of how others think about leadership problems and how his thinking compares with theirs. Several students commented that the small group discussion made it possible for experienced soldiers in the class to provide helpful information to inexperienced soldiers. The discussion technique was said to increase interest and the informality encouraged all to participate. The students felt that good solutions were developed in the discussion groups.

The tendency for small group discussions to stray from the central topic or to become disorganized was a disadvantage. Other disadvantages mentioned included lack of participation by some students, and the tendency of certain students to dominate the discussion and keep others from participating or from influencing the thinking of the group.

The comments about the panel discussion emphasized the following advantages: the presentation of all points of view before the entire class, the high level of interest created by the discussion, and the experience of talking before a large group. Comments suggested that the panel discussions were best when the discussion quickly developed into one in which all members of the class participated.

Disadvantages were related to lack of time for all panel members to participate, lack of audience participation in some cases, and the dependence of the quality of discussion on the panel members' ability and preparation. Some panels were good; others were not.

The last question had to do with ways in which the training would be helpful to the students. They reported that the training increased their awareness

of this type of problem and gave them a broader point of view by showing them how others thought about such problems; it gave them an opportunity to gain experience with problems similar to those they will meet on the job, showed how the problems can be solved in a constructive manner, and allowed the student to gain confidence and skill in his judgment.

Several suggestions for improvement of the training were included:

(1) Act out solutions more frequently;
(2) Include an introductory period on principles of leadership;
(3) Include more problems;
(4) Allow opportunity to practice solving problems individually;
(5) Use films to present all problems.

No attempt was made to collect similar data from the classes receiving the conventional training, since it was not desired to demonstrate that the experimental training was more palatable to the students than the conventional training. The purpose was rather to determine whether the students judged the experimental training to be interesting and helpful and to obtain suggestions for its improvement.

It was clear from comments made by students in the experimental classes that the film presentation was superior to written or oral descriptions of problems, which is the method for presenting problems in regular leadership classes.

Instructors' Evaluation of Course

The instructors' comments concerning the experimental training were essentially parallel to those made by the students. They stated that the films introduced tensions, moods, and surroundings which would not be described adequately in short written problems.

They mentioned that the group discussions need some control or monitoring to minimize the tendency to discuss irrelevant topics. One modification which should help to keep all students active in the small group discussion and to keep the discussions on the topic would be to name the representative of each small group after they have completed their discussion and just prior to the panel discussion.

The instructors recommended that the sound film–discussion technique be used in conjunction with several hours training in leadership theory. They suggested that all problems be presented with films. Detailed suggestions concerning modification of specific problems were incorporated in the revision of the manual.

Officer Leadership Questionnaire

Free Answer Form

One half of the students in each class wrote out responses to the problems in the free answer form of the Officer Leadership Questionnaire. The data obtained from these free answer forms for OCS classes were

analyzed to determine the frequency with which post-training responses were superior to pre-training responses.[1]

Pre- and post- responses for each question were stripped of information identifying them as control or experimental, and were fastened together. The top and bottom positions were assigned to the pre- and post- response in each pair randomly. Three judges, working independently, read each pair of responses to a given question and made one of three judgments: (1) the top response was better, (2) the bottom response was better, or (3) the two responses were equivalent in quality. The criteria for evaluating the quality of the responses included:

(1) Did the analysis of the problem and the proposed solution consider the long-range functioning of the group?
(2) Did the proposed action contribute to improvement of the immediate situation?
(3) Did the analysis of the problem and the proposed action consider the attitudes and motivations of individuals involved in the problem?

A response was considered to be the better of two responses when it was more complete in the coverage of the above points.

Each individual received a score of +1 when a post- response was judged superior to a pre- response, a -1 when a pre- response was judged superior to a post- response, and a 0 when the two responses were judged equal. Since there were three judgments for each item, the item score could range over the integers from -3 to +3.

Only those subjects who completed answers to the first six questions on both pre- and post- forms were used in the analysis. This necessitated dropping seven subjects from the experimental group and eight subjects from the control group. The mean values for questions one through six are given in Table 3. The last four questions were not analyzed because they were answered by only a few members of each class.

Table 3

MEANS FOR
QUESTIONS ONE THROUGH SIX ON
OFFICER LEADERSHIP QUESTIONNAIRE
(Free Answer Form)

Questions	Experimental Subjects (N=36)	Control Subjects (N=51)
1	-.36	-.84
2	.08	-.12
3	.53	-.24
4	.06	-.31
5	.44	-.16
6	.08	-.65

A total score was computed for each subject by adding the six item scores. The means of these total scores for the experimental and control groups were +0.833 and -2.314 respectively.[2] An inspection of the data indicated that the assumption of normality was not tenable; consequently a Mann-Whitney U test was employed.[3] The results of this test were significant beyond

[1]The number of these forms completed by the OBC classes was too small for analysis.

[2]It is interesting to note that the mean scores for the control are in all cases negative. However, one cannot draw the conclusion that the training led to this decrement; in fact, an evaluation of this result would depend on the incorporation of another control group which was pre- and post- tested but received no leadership training.

[3]Lincoln E. Moses, "Non-Parametric Statistics for Psychological Research," *Psychological Bulletin*, Vol. 49, 1952, pp. 122-143.

the .01 level,[4] thus supporting the hypothesis that students who had received the experimental training were more skillful in formulating solutions to leadership problems than were those who had received the conventional training.

To measure agreement among the judges, pairwise correlations were computed. The score used in the analysis was the total for a given judge over the first six questions; hence the scores could range over the integers from -6 to +6. The pairwise combinations for the three judges resulted in correlation coefficients of .52, .48, and .52. An inspection of the three scatter diagrams indicated that the sets of points could be satisfactorily fitted with a linear function. Fisher's z-distribution was employed to test the hypothesis that the observed correlations would occur by chance alone from populations whose correlation parameters were zero. Employing the two tails of the distribution all three coefficients were calculated to be significantly different from zero at or beyond the .05 level.

Rank Order Form

The rank order form of the Officer Leadership Questionnaire provided five alternative solutions to each problem, and the student was asked to rank the solutions in order from one to five. An index of pre- to post- change was computed on each of the 10 questions; this was done by comparing the post-selection order with the pre- selection order and summating the magnitude of change over the number of changes. For example, if the post- selection was E-D-C-B-A and the pre- order was E-A-D-C-B, the index of change would be six; that is, from post- to pre- (1) E remains fixed and contributes zero change; (2) D, C, and B each are displaced one position and contribute a total of three units of change; (3) A is displaced three positions and contributes three units of change, making a total of six units of change.

Scores derived by summating over the 10 questions for each subject were used as the index of pre- to post- change. The N's for the experimental and control groups were 44 and 43 respectively. The means for the experimental and control groups were 36.57 and 34.60. A t test of the difference between these means was run; the computed value of $t = 0.96$ (df 85) is not significant at the .05 level. This result indicates that there was no real difference in the amount of change between pre- and post- responses shown by the experimental and control groups.

The possibility remained that the direction of change could be different for the two groups. A count was made of the frequency with which each item alternative was ranked in each of the five ranking positions. An inspection of these frequencies revealed that changes were in the same direction for both groups on all items. No further analyses of these data were made.

Ideal Officer Form

The Ideal Officer Form contained 29 items which were scored with the "consideration" and "initiating structure" keys developed by Hemphill and

[4] In this case, U is normally distributed with mean 918 and standard deviation 116.03; the computed value of U was 622.5.

Halpin.[4] The form is reproduced in Appendix B; Items 1-15 comprise the "initiating structure scale," and Items 16-29 the "consideration scale." Two difference scores were computed for each student: a post- minus pre- "consideration" score and a post- minus pre- "initiating structure" score. Separate 2 by 2 analyses of variance were run on each set of scores with type of training as one variable and OCS versus OBC as the other; there were 88 subjects in each of the four groups.

The analysis of "initiating structure" difference scores is summarized in Tables 4 and 5; neither of the main effects nor the interaction is significant at the .05 level. The analysis of "consideration" difference scores, summarized in Tables 6 and 7, showed neither of the main effects nor the interaction to be significant at the .05 level.

Table 4

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF INITIATING STRUCTURE SCORES

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Degrees of Freedom	Mean Square	*F*
OCS–OBC	2.56	1	2.56	1.31
Type of training	3.28	1	3.28	1.68
Interaction	.18	1	.18	.10
Within groups	677.98	348	1.95	
Total	684.00	351		

Table 5

MEANS OF INITIATING STRUCTURE SCORES

Class	Experimental	Control
OCS	–.747	–.531
OBC	–.544	–.417

Table 6

MEANS OF CONSIDERATION SCORES

Class	Experimental	Control
OCS	–1.066	–.840
OBC	– .983	–.860

Table 7

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF CONSIDERATION SCORES

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Degrees of Freedom	Mean Square	*F*
OCS–OBC	.10	1	.10	.03
Type of training	3.28	1	3.28	1.00
Interaction	.29	1	.29	.09
Within groups	1143.77	348	3.29	
Total	1147.44	351		

[4]See references 5, 6.

Student Judgment Form

Each student nominated his selections for the top 10 leaders in the class. Using the OCS final over-all class standing of the students as the criterion for ranking them as leaders, the average leadership rank of the 10 students nominated by each student was computed. This index indicated the degree to which each student selected the better leaders in the class. Only OCS classes were included in this analysis, because there was no final criterion in the OBC classes which weighed leadership qualities; OBC final evaluations are based only on academic grades.

In computing these indices, the final class standing rank was converted into a percentile measure; for example, if a student ranked 10th in a class of 40, he received a percentile measure of 25. These percentile measures were used to compute the average percentile measure of the 10 students nominated. This was done to avoid differences contributed by unequal N's in the various classes. Since pre- and post-training judgment forms were available for all subjects used in the analysis, pre- and post- scores could be computed. These scores were called agreement scores, referring to agreement with final class standing rankings.

The analysis was based on a difference score obtained by subtracting the post- agreement score from the pre- agreement score. A lower agreement score would indicate greater agreement between the nominations and the final class standing. Consequently, a positive difference score represents improvement in ability to select leaders; a negative difference, a decrement in ability.

There were 87 subjects in both the experimental and control groups. The mean for the experimental group was +2.35, the mean for the control group -0.96. A t test (df 172) yielded a value significant beyond the .05 level of confidence. A check was made on the assumption of homogeneity of variance by computing the F ratio between the experimental group variance and the control group variance; the obtained value was 1.07, which was not significant at the .10 level of confidence.

A second analysis of the difference scores was run in order to determine whether or not the effect of the leadership training on ability to select good leaders depended on the subjects' pre-training judging ability. This was done by trichotomizing both the experimental and control groups with respect to the subjects' pre- agreement scores. The top third of each class with regard to pre- agreement scores represented one condition of this variable, the middle third another, and the bottom third another. The means for the resulting six groups are given in Table 8. An analysis of variance was run and is summarized in Table 9.

Table 8

MEANS OF AGREEMENT DIFFERENCE SCORES

Group	Top Third	Middle Third	Bottom Third
Experimental	–2.51	+ .69	+8.88
Control	–3.69	–2.31	+3.13

Table 9

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF AGREEMENT DIFFERENCE SCORES

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Degrees of Freedom	Mean Square	*F*
Between training conditions	475.37	1	475.37	8.36
Between initial levels	2687.81	2	1343.91	23.64
Interaction	153.43	2	76.71	1.35
Within cells	9549.94	168	56.84	
Total	12866.54	173		

Both variables were significant beyond the .01 level of confidence. The interaction effect was not significant. An application of Bartlett's test supported the belief that these samples are not heterogeneous in variance.

In view of these results, it is concluded that the training variable was effective in modifying behavior with regard to selection of leaders, and, further, that the effected change was negatively related to pre-training selection ability.

SUMMARY

The results of this study strongly suggest that the sound film–discussion technique for leadership training is superior to present leadership training.

The modified training effected greater changes than the conventional training in two types of leadership behavior, both of which would seem to be important to successful performance as junior officers. Improvement in ability to analyze and solve leadership problems should enable the officer to deal with actual problems more skillfully. The ability to evaluate leadership qualities in others is a very important part of the leader's job. In both of these abilities, students receiving the modified training improved more than those receiving regular training.

The reactions of both students and instructors to the training were favorable. Especially encouraging were the students' comments which reflected a broadening of their point of view in dealing with leadership problems. They recognized from their experiences in this training that there are usually several acceptable approaches to problems. They felt that they gained experience in analyzing problems and expressed the feeling of gaining confidence in their judgment. Perhaps one of the most important results of the training is that, according to their statements, they learned to recognize the existence of problems which otherwise they might overlook, and thus allow unsolved problems to accumulate and develop into major sources of tension and unrest.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
AND
APPENDICES

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Bradford, L. P., *et al.*, *Explorations in Human Relations Training*, National Training Laboratory, Bethel, Maine, 1953.

2. Canter, R. R., "A Human Relations Training Program," *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 35, 1951, pp. 38-45.

3. Evans, J. J. and Newton, T. G., "Sound-slide Films Help Armstrong Cork Train Supervisors," *Personnel Journal*, Vol. 29, 1950, pp. 126-133.

4. Fleishman, Edwin A., *"Leadership Climate" and Supervisory Behavior*, Personnel Research Board, The Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio, 1951.

5. Halpin, Andrew W. and Winer, B. J., *Studies in Aircrew Composition III: The Leadership Behavior of the Airplane Commander*, Ohio State University Research Foundation, Columbus, Ohio, 1952.

6. Hemphill, J. K. and Coons, A. E., *Leader Behavior Description*, Personnel Research Board, The Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio, 1950.

7. Maier, N. R. F. and Solem, A. R., "Audience Role Playing: A New Method in Human Relations Training," *Human Relations*, Vol. 4, 1951, pp. 279-294.

8. Maier, N. R. F. and Zerfoss, L. F., "MRP: A Technique for Training Large Groups of Supervisors and Its Potential Use in Social Research," *Human Relations*, Vol. 5, 1952, pp. 177-186.

9. Maier, N. R. F., *Principles of Human Relations*, John Wiley & Sons, Inc., New York, 1952.

Appendix A

DESCRIPTIONS OF LEADERSHIP PROBLEMS USED IN THE EXPERIMENTAL COURSE

The filmed problems used in the experimental leadership training are described below. The last problem is in script form, the remaining problems in narrative form.

FILM NUMBER 3

Sgt. Dawson, a Section Chief, is being transferred. His assistant, Cpl. Carlin, wants the job and he asks Dawson to put in a good word with the 1st Sgt. for him. Sgt. Dawson discusses the matter of his successor with Sgt. Allen, the 1st Sgt. In the course of their conversation it is brought out that Cpl. Carlin has been bucking very hard for the job. In addition, it is revealed that six months earlier a man had been made assistant to Dawson, and Carlin, who wanted that job, had caused so much trouble that the man who was appointed Assistant Section Chief had asked for a transfer. Carlin had been given the job because no one else would take it. Dawson feels that Carlin lacks a sense of responsibility and would not make a satisfactory section chief. Other possibilities are discussed, and the 1st Sgt. finally agrees that a man in another section should be recommended to Lt. Williams, who must make the decision. Meanwhile, Lt. Williams has been out to the site where Dawson's section is digging a gun emplacement. The Lt., who has been commissioned very recently and who has been with the unit for only a short time, is quite impressed with Carlin's apparent efficiency. When he returns to the Orderly Room he discusses the matter of the appointment with the 1st Sgt. He feels that Carlin should get the job. The Sgt., however, argues that he should not and relates to the Lt. what he knows about Carlin's goofing off and the previous difficulties they have had with him. The Lt., however, still seems inclined to give Carlin the job. He tells the Sgt. that he will give him his decision that afternoon.

FILM NUMBER 8

This film has its setting in a combat zone. Capt. Prusk, a Battery Commander, has called in Lt. Trout, one of his officers. He orders Trout to improve his section so that it will make a better showing on future inspections. Trout instructs his Senior NCO, Sgt. Moar, to get the section on the ball. Moar is happy to do this. He is an old hand and has felt that the men were too lax, but did not know how the Lt. felt about it. Several weeks later Capt. Prusk commends the Lt. for getting his section in shape. Lt. Trout gives most of the credit to Sgt. Moar. The men in the section, meanwhile, are complaining a great deal about the stringent measures that Moar has taken. They feel that they are getting a dangerously small amount of sleep because Moar keeps them so busy getting ready for inspections. A man had been hurt the day before and they are convinced that he was injured because he was so tired he couldn't function properly. They complain to the Sgt., but he rejects the complaint, saying that they are not being mistreated. Finally they

go to see Lt. Trout about the matter. He agrees to look into the matter, and calls the Sgt. in. The Sgt. rejects the idea that the men are not getting enough sleep and reminds the Lt. that they have been doing very well on the inspections as the Lt. wanted them to do. The Lt. states that he appreciates the good job Moar has done, but that he thinks he should ease up on the men. Moar states that he cannot promise to keep up the good inspection record unless he has a free hand in working the men.

FILM NUMBER 5

Sgt. McCobb, a Mess Sgt., and one of his cooks are discussing the placement of the kitchen tent for a field training problem in which they are engaged. They decide on a spot which is level and shaded and close to the supply tent. It is noted that their CO does not like to have the kitchen tent too near the Battalion CP, and that the chosen spot meets that requirement also. Their new mess officer is a recent OCS graduate. In a discussion between this officer, Lt. Johnson, and the Battery Commander, Capt. Lane, it is made clear that Johnson has had little field experience, but that he has boned up on the manuals and feels confident that he can handle any situation that may arise. The Lt. then goes to supervise the setting up of the kitchen tent. When he arrives in the area, he calls Sgt. McCobb over and tells him immediately that the site McCobb has chosen will not be satisfactory because it is too far from the road. McCobb states respectfully that there is too much dust near the road, that they have always done it this way in the past, that there is no need to be near the road in order to get supplies easier inasmuch as they already have most of the supplies they will need. Lt. Johnson becomes angry, saying that the Sgt. is insubordinate and that the manual says to do it his way. While this discussion is going on Capt. Lane comes up and asks what the argument is about. Johnson accuses the Sgt. of refusing to obey orders and McCobb replies that the reason they wanted to set up in this spot is that in the past Capt. Lane had always told them to set up some place where it was not dusty and away from the Battalion CP.

FILM NUMBER 1

Most of the men in a training company have either gone on pass or have left the company area shortly after noon on a Saturday. At this time it is ordered by a higher headquarters that the company provide a detail of fifteen men to clean up the infiltration course area, which was used by this company the night before. The 1st Sgt. is able to get only ten men, because they are the only ones left in the area. One of these men, who had been given his pass but was still in the barracks, comes in to complain to the Sgt. about being on detail. He asserts that he cannot go on detail because his parents have driven a thousand miles to spend the weekend with him, and he expects them any minute. The 1st Sgt. refuses to release him, saying that the detail is already short several men. The trainee asks to see the CO. The Sgt. tells him to go ahead but that it will do him no good because he (the Sgt.) is in full charge of details and he has made his decision. The foregoing discussion has been overheard by the CO who is in his office.

FILM NUMBER 2

Sgt. Beam, a Radio Sgt., is being briefed by the Battery Exec., Lt. Baker, about a training problem which is to be carried out the next day. The problem will require that the radio equipment be set up in the field by 0800 hours. It is decided, therefore, that it will be best to load the equipment on the vehicles the night before and then store the loaded vehicles in the garage

overnight so that it will not be necessary to place a guard on them. The vehicles are to be loaded after duty hours, since they will not be back in the motor pool until then. Sgt. Beam is instructed to make arrangements with Sgt. Mines, the Motor Sgt., to do this. When he is informed of this plan, Mines objects strenuously, saying that the other men will mess up his garage and that it has to be in particularly good shape because there is a Battalion inspection the next day. He agrees reluctantly, however, because Beam tells him the Lt. wants it done that way. However, he warns Beam to be sure and clean up any dirt they make. In the afternoon of the next day, Sgt. Mines comes in to see Lt. Baker. He complains that the radio section messed up his shop and that his section was rated down on the inspection because of it. He admits that they left a detail to clean up, but asserts that they did not do a good job. The Lt. reminds him that it is the unit's mission to set up training problems and his job to supply the vehicles they need. Mines agrees but states that he cannot run a good shop if other people interfere.

FILM NUMBER 9

This film has its setting in a combat zone. An Artillery Unit has been wiped out except for three men who have managed to get away in an abandoned jeep. One of these men is a Lt. Their jeep runs out of gas and they have to get off the road on foot. Another small group of Infantrymen led by a Sgt. is cut off. The Sgt. has told the men that he thinks they should surrender since there seems to be no other way of getting out alive. The Lt. and the two men with him come up at about this time. The Sgt. tells the Lt. what their situation is, that the only possible way out is across an open field which is covered by the enemy. He states again that he thinks they should surrender. The Lt., however, decides that they should try to get across the field and orders the men to move out. The Sgt. tells them that they are crazy if they do, that they will all be killed.

FILM NUMBER 4

A group of men are digging a gun emplacement. Sgt. Watson is in charge of the detail. The work is proceeding in a rather desultory fashion. Lt. Bracken comes up to check on their progress. He is very familiar with the Sgt., calling him by his first name, etc. He also deprecates the importance of the job, saying that he cannot see why the CO wants it done, and he tells the men not to work too hard. When he leaves, Sgt. Watson comments that the Lt. is a nice guy and that if he were running things they would not have so many useless jobs to do. At about this time, a request is received from the 1st Sgt. for some men for a detail. Watson feels that he cannot spare the men and goes to see the 1st Sgt. about it. They get into an argument, and Watson asserts that he will send the Lt. to see the 1st Sgt. about the matter. As Watson leaves the Orderly Room he meets Lt. Bracken and greets him in a very familiar fashion. He mentions the detail jokingly to the Lt. Later Capt. Cole, the CO, tells Bracken that he isn't satisfied with the progress of the emplacement and sends him out to check on it. Bracken goes out to the emplacement site. Watson greets him in a joking manner and makes some reference to all the useless jobs the CO foists off on them. By this time Bracken is serious and realizes that he has made a mistake in not pushing to get the job done, but Watson still feels that Bracken will not give him a bad time about getting the work finished.

FILM NUMBER 7

A Battery Commander, Capt. Johnson, has been pleased with the work of a Cpl. in the supply section. As a result he wants to give him a three-day pass. Before doing so, however, he

check it with the Supply Sgt., Sgt. Burton, who is Cpl. Adams' superior. Sgt. Burton seemed very willing to let the Cpl. go. On Friday morning Cpl. Adams comes in to pick up his pass, but the 1st Sgt. informs him that he has received a call from Sgt. Burton and that Burton does not want to let him go. Adams goes in to see the CO about it. The CO asks him what the problem is. Adams tells him that the day before (Thursday) some dirty weapons had come into the Supply Room, and that he had been ordered by Sgt. Burton to come in and clean them the next morning. He reminded the Sgt. that he had a pass starting that morning. Burton, however, told him that he could not go on the pass until the weapons were cleaned up. Adams became angry at this and asserted that since the Capt. had okayed him for the pass, the Sgt. could not keep him from going and that he intended to take off the next day. At about the time Adams finishes telling his story, Sgt. Burton comes in and asks to see the Capt. The Capt. sends Adams out and asks Burton in. Burton tells him the same story about the incidents of the previous day and adds that he does not think Adams should be given a pass in view of the fact that he had disobeyed his order to come in and clean the weapons. The Capt. states that he will give both of them his decision immediately.

FILM NUMBER 10

This film has its setting in a combat zone. An Artillery Unit receives a call from a higher headquarters saying that an attack scheduled for the next day has been moved up a half hour from the time previously planned. The Artillery Unit is instructed to inform one of the participating Infantry Units of the change, since they are the only ones who have a telephone line through to the Infantry Unit. An attempt is made to get through, but the line is out. Two men from the Communications Section are sent out to find and repair the break. After two hours they have not returned and the line is still out. Capt. Knoles, the Battery Commander, orders a patrol out to see if they can find the two men. He decides that a runner will have to be sent with the message, since it is of such vital importance. He goes to inform Sgt. Kelp, who is in charge of the Communications Section, of this. Kelp is ordered to send one of his men as a runner, but he is reluctant to do this, because his men are very jittery about the other two men not coming back. He asserts that he thinks it would be best if he goes on the mission himself. The Capt., however, states that Kelp cannot be spared at this time and orders him to send one of his men. He reluctantly agrees. However, instead of doing as ordered, he goes himself and does not tell his men that he is supposed to send one of them. It is a hazardous mission, but Kelp completes it successfully. When he returns, the Capt. calls him in and asks him to explain why he disobeyed his order. Kelp asserts again that he did not think he could trust the mission to anyone else because his men were so nervous.

FILM NUMBER 6

CAST:
CAPT. BRAY ..... BATTERY COMMANDER
SGT. STRONG ..... BATTERY 1ST SGT.
SGT. DENBY ..... CHIEF OF SECTION
CPL. GORDON ..... ASST. CHIEF OF SECTION

SCENE I

(CAPT. BRAY'S OFFICE. CAPT. BRAY ENTERS THE OFFICE AND IMPATIENTLY PUTS HIS HAT DOWN ON HIS DESK. HE SITS AT HIS DESK AND BEGINS SHUFFLING ANGRILY THROUGH SOME PAPERS.)

SGT. STRONG: Good morning, sir.

CAPT. BRAY: Good morning, Sergeant.

SGT. STRONG: Here's the AWOL report you asked for.

CAPT. BRAY: Oh, fine. Thank you, Sergeant. (LOOKS AT REPORT) Have you got a copy I can take up to Battalion this afternoon?

SGT. STRONG: Yes, sir, I'll have one for you in just a few minutes. (TURNS TO LEAVE) How'd it go on the firing range this morning, sir?

CAPT. BRAY: Pretty well, with the exception of one crew that was consistently late for firing. It's been a long time since I've seen a more uncoordinated group of men.

SGT. STRONG: What group is that, sir?

CAPT. BRAY: Sergeant Denby's.

SGT. STRONG: Oh, Sergeant Denby's been on leave, sir. Corporal Gordon's been handling that section all week long. Denby reported back just before you got in from the field, sir.

CAPT. BRAY: Well, Gordon better shape up or he won't make sergeant in my outfit. I want that whole section restricted over the weekend so they can practice their loading drills.

SGT. STRONG: Well, what about the other sections?

CAPT. BRAY: They'll go on pass as usual.

SGT. STRONG: Yes sir.

(FADE OUT)

SCENE II

(CPL. GORDON IS TALKING TO HIS SECTION.)

CPL. GORDON: That's what the CO said—practice it and get it right and we won't have to stay next time. O.K., you guys take off.

SECTION MEMBERS: (AD LIB) "Hey, here comes the Sarge", "Hi, Sarge", etc.

CPL. GORDON: Hi, Sarge, how've things been going? Glad to see you back. (THEN TO THE MEMBERS OF THE SECTION) You guys take off, I'll be with you in a minute.

SGT. DENBY: How have things been going, Bob?

CPL. GORDON: Things haven't been going so well, Sarge. The CO was out here this morning watching our loading drill. We messed up pretty bad while he was here.

SGT. DENBY: What seems to be the trouble? Things were going great when I left.

CPL. GORDON: I guess I just haven't been on the ball like I should. Look, Sarge, I've got some troubles at home—I've been worried about it all week.

SGT. DENBY: What's wrong? Is the wife sick or something?

CPL. GORDON: No, it's—well, it's personal. I just didn't want the word to get around.

SGT. DENBY: Well, why can't you take off over the weekend and take care of it?

CPL. GORDON: That's the trouble. I was going to do just that, but we found out just before you came from the First Sergeant that the CO has restricted us this weekend to practice our drilling. The story is our section is low in the Battery. The CO says we have to do some extra drilling to catch up.

SGT. DENBY: What you ought to do is go see the CO right now. Why don't you take off, and tell him I sent you.

CPL. GORDON: O.K., Sarge, thanks.

(FADE OUT)

SCENE III

(CAPT. BRAY'S OFFICE. THERE IS A KNOCK AT THE DOOR. BRAY LOOKS UP FROM HIS DESK.)

CAPT. BRAY: Come in.

(ENTER CPL. GORDON)

CPL. GORDON: (SALUTING) Good afternoon, sir.

CAPT. BRAY: (RETURNS SALUTE) Oh, it's you, Gordon.

CPL. GORDON: Yes sir. Sergeant Denby just got back from leave, sir, and he suggested that I come up and see you. You see, sir, I—I need a pass.

CAPT. BRAY: You want a pass? ! Well, Corporal, you know your whole section is not getting passes this weekend?

CPL. GORDON: Yes, sir, but it's—well, it's kind of a personal problem. You see, I've got to get home right away.

CAPT. BRAY: Well, what's the trouble, Corporal?

CPL. GORDON: Well, it's a personal problem, sir. It's about my little boy.

CAPT. BRAY: Corporal Gordon, your entire section is on restriction this weekend. I'll have to know the full story before I can decide about letting you go.

CPL. GORDON: Well, I just got a letter from our neighbors. They have been keeping my little boy since last Saturday night. It seems that my wife left him with them last Saturday when she left to do some shopping, and she never did come back.

CAPT. BRAY: When did you hear about this?

CPL. GORDON: I got the letter yesterday, sir.

CAPT. BRAY: Do you know any reason why your wife would leave your little boy? Maybe she was in an accident. We probably should check with the police.

CPL. GORDON: No sir, there's – there's more to the story. I – I been getting other letters about Betty Lou – that's my wife – for the past couple of months now. She's not bad or anything. It's just that she likes to have a good time. Since I been in the Army – well, things haven't been too good for her. A couple of months ago I got a letter from a buddy of mine and in it he talks about Betty Lou and he said he's seen her around town with some guys. Well, at first I didn't pay any attention to it, but then I began thinking about it and I began worrying. Then my mother, she never liked Betty Lou, she writes me a letter and says the kid doesn't have decent clothes and how every time she calls over at the house Betty Lou's never home. Sir, my kid's four years old, and he's a good kid. I just gotta get home and see what's up. You know, sir, this isn't the kind of story that I'd like to get around. I woulda come to you sooner except that I – I just didn't want anyone to know.

Appendix B

DESCRIPTION OF EVALUATION INSTRUMENTS

The content of the various evaluation instruments is reproduced below. The questions in the free answer form of the Officer Leadership Questionnaire are not reproduced because they were the same as the questions in the rank order form.

STUDENT EVALUATION OF LEADERSHIP COURSE

INSTRUCTIONS: It will aid us to evaluate the leadership training course you have taken if you would comment on it. Please express your opinions and impressions as fully, frankly, and carefully as possible. Your answers have no connection with your military career, will be used for research purposes, and will be held in strict confidence. (Use back of answer sheets if more space is desired.)

A. Please describe the advantages and disadvantages of the following:

(1) Film presentation of problems
(2) Small group discussions
(3) Panel discussions

B. Will this training be useful to you in carrying out your future responsibilities as an officer? If so, in what ways?

OFFICER LEADERSHIP QUESTIONNAIRE (RANK ORDER FORM)

INSTRUCTIONS: Here are some problems occurring in military life. Below each are listed different actions an officer might take in dealing with them. Read each problem and the actions supplied for it. Decide how closely each action resembles the way you would handle the problem.

On the answer sheet there are numbered spaces for each problem. In these spaces record the letters of the actions in the order of your preference. That is, in the first space write the letter of the action most resembling what you would do. Then fill in your second, third, fourth and fifth choices. Do not omit any.

You may not like any of the actions or you may like several equally well. Nevertheless, make decisions about them so that you can record them in order from "most preferred" to "least preferred".

After you have recorded the letters in the order of your preference, circle the letters of the actions you think are acceptable. If you feel none are acceptable, do not circle any; if you think some are, circle those; if you think all are acceptable, circle all of them.

Your answers for the problems might look something like this:

"March of Dimes"	"Drinking in Barracks"	"Standing Reveille"
1. A	1. B	1. C
2. C	2. D	2. D
3. D	3. E	3. B
4. E	4. A	4. A
5. B	5. C	5. E

(1) DIFFICULT 2nd COOK

"Sir, I won't have this man working in my mess hall," said the Battery's Mess Steward. "He's been in two fights in two weeks, comes on shift late, doesn't do his work and upsets everyone else. This morning he came in and started an argument with the first cook over who was to clean the pans. I can usually handle difficult people, and I know we have a hard time getting replacements, but I'm not going to put up with him anymore!"

This was the first the Mess Officer heard of trouble with the new second cook. The mess hall was still short handed and replacements were difficult to get. THE MESS OFFICER SHOULD:

A. Transfer the second cook within the battery.
B. Instruct the Mess Sgt. to give the man extra duty until he shapes up.
C. Call in the second cook and warn him that disciplinary action will be taken if he doesn't shape up.
D. Tell the Sgt. that he will have to keep the second cook because there are no replacements, and that it is his job to keep control of his cooks.
E. Call in the second cook and try to find out why he is acting the way he is.

(2) FEEDING THE OBSERVER TEAM

The Arty. Liaison Officer, Capt. Arnold, said that Lt. Hayes' Forward Observer Team would be fed by "F" Company. The first day they worked with "F" Company the team radio operator reported that the Mess Sgt. in "F" Company refused to serve chow to the team. The chow line is about to close. WHAT DOES LT. HAYES DO ABOUT THIS?

A. Goes directly to the Mess Sgt. and orders him to feed his men.
B. Contacts Capt. Arnold to find out what the foul-up was.
C. Goes directly to the Mess Sgt. to find out why his men were not fed.
D. Goes to the CO of "F" Company to find out if the word had been properly passed down.
E. Goes to the CO of "F" Company to arrange to get his men fed.

(3) RIFLE CLEANING

Lt. Shepard was detailed to Infantry. His first assignment was to a basic training company as the Exec. Officer. One day, early in the training cycle, he was observing the rifle cleaning in

one of the platoons. A sergeant was supervising the group. During a spot check he discovered that one of the privates was trying to force the bolt in the wrong way. LT. SHEPARD SAID:

A. "Didn't the Rifle Committee teach you any better than that, Pvt.?"
B. "Sgt., show this man the right way to assemble this weapon."
C. "Sgt., is this the way you teach your men to assemble a rifle?"
D. "Men, stop what you're doing and gather around over here. I want to show you how to assemble a rifle."
E. "Let me show you the right way to assemble this weapon, Pvt."

(4) AWOL CORPORAL

Lt. Evans' job in the Battery to which he was assigned was Motor Officer. A few days after assuming duties, a corporal, one of his mechanics, approached him. He wanted a favor and when the Lt. inquired about it, the corporal explained as follows, "Sir, I was wondering if the Lt. would put in a good word for me with the Captain? It's about my being AWOL Monday. I missed the last bus back to camp and had to wait all day until they started running again. I'm on my way to the Orderly Room now and I've heard that the Battery Commander is going to have me busted. It's going to be hard for me; I've been busted once before in the Battery. If I get busted again my wife will get less on her allotment." WHAT DOES THE LT. DO?

A. States that he does not wish to interfere with the Battery CO's judgment in disciplinary matters.
B. Expresses sympathy but says he doesn't know the corporal well enough to speak to the CO.
C. Agrees to put in a good word for his corporal even though he feels he can do little for him.
D. Explains to the corporal that he should talk to the Battery Commander about his problem.
E. Points out that the corporal's case is not strong enough for the Lt. to put in a good word for him.

(5) RETRIEVING WIRE

Lt. Butler, Bn Commo Officer, was working with his wire crew retrieving their field wire. They entered a clearing and saw a wire crew from an Infantry Mortar Company retrieving the artillery wire from the other end. After an exchange of nods and a moment of uncertainty as to what to do, the Lt. with the Infantry picked up a pair of cutters as if to sever the wire between the two crews. LT. BUTLER GOT OUT OF HIS VEHICLE AND SAID:

A. "Don't cut that wire, Lt., I want all of that artillery wire."
B. "I suppose at this point cutting it is all that can be done."
C. "Haven't you made a mistake, Lt.? That's our artillery wire."
D. "Wait a minute, Lt. One of us has been reeling up the wrong wire."
E. "I wouldn't cut that wire if I were you, Lt., you'll save yourself a headache."

(6) PULLING FIVE PASSES

A certain Btry CO was a harsh disciplinarian. Several senior NCOs attributed the Battery's high AWOL rate to his strictness. Lt. Rogers is given command of this Battery. He decides to

allow passes for up to fifty percent of the men in accord with Battalion policy. In his third week in the Battery, Lt. Rogers posts a list of all those eligible for pass. Almost every man signs. On Friday of the same week, Battalion orders an especially large detail for all day Saturday. It will require pulling passes on five men to fill the detail. In talking to his 1st Sgt., Lt. Rogers learns that Battalion is used to getting large details from the Battery, knowing that they were always available under the former CO. WHAT SHOULD LT. ROGERS DO ABOUT THIS?

A. Explain to the Bn CO why the detail will be five men short, mentioning the Battalion pass policy.
B. Explain the situation to the pass men and ask for five volunteers.
C. Have the pass men draw lots for the details.
D. Ask each pass man what his plans are and decide on that basis which five men can forego their passes.
E. Pull five passes in some fair way but explain to the Bn CO that to get so many men on short notice again will be difficult because more of them will be eligible for pass.

(7) ON KP & ON PASS

KP rosters are posted weekly, men coming up alphabetically. Although it is obvious that Pvt. King will come up for KP on Sunday, the Platoon Sgt. fails to post the roster Saturday morning. It is the 1st Sgt.'s responsibility to check duty rosters and pass lists for conflicts. Pvt. King is on the pass list for the weekend. At noon, Saturday, King picks up his pass and leaves for the weekend. On Sunday he fails to report for KP. HOW SHOULD THE CO OF THE UNIT DEAL WITH THE MATTER?

A. Tell the 1st Sgt. to let the matter drop; that such mistakes are easily made.
B. A verbal reprimand for Pvt. King is all that is necessary.
C. A verbal reprimand is in order for the Platoon Sgt. and 1st Sgt.
D. All three men should be verbally reprimanded since each is partly responsible.
E. Reprimand the sergeants verbally and give Pvt. King company punishment.

(8) CHARCOAL SHORTAGE

Lt. Ricks is Exec Officer in charge of a Firing Battery at the MLR. It is winter. The Fire Direction Center in out of charcoal. Ricks cannot get any more from supply because their stock is exhausted and they will not have any for at least forty-eight hours. Returning to the Center he finds that the men have taken some from the Gun Section Bunkers without the gun sections knowing about it. He orders them to return the fuel. The whole group is against this, complaining that they have been freezing for days and the other sections can spare the fuel. WHAT DOES LT. RICKS DO NOW?

A. Lt. Ricks backs up his order although the objections are understandable.
B. Ricks decides to withdraw his order after taking account of conditions in the bunker.
C. Finds out which men took the fuel and directs his order to them personally.
D. Explains that he understands how they feel but only lets them keep part of the fuel.
E. Ricks lets his men keep the fuel but warns that he will take action against anyone taking fuel again.

(9) MEETING THE PLATOON

After completing Artillery Basic Course, Lt. Harmon is assigned by his new Bn CO to one of the batteries. He is introduced to his 1st Sgt. who takes him to the barracks to meet the men. The men come to attention as they enter. "As you were." says Lt. Harmon. The 1st Sgt. has the men gather around saying, "Men, I would like to introduce Lt. Harmon who will be our new Executive Officer. He would like to say a few words to you." WHAT OPENING REMARK DOES LT. HARMON MAKE?

A. "This is my first assignment as an Executive Officer. You men look sharp and I want you to stay that way."
B. "I'm not going to make any changes in how the platoon is run now."
C. "If you have any problems, feel free to come to me."
D. "I'm going to expect a lot from you men; especially the Squad and Section Leaders."
E. "You are my first platoon. I'm looking forward to working with you and hope that you feel the same."

(10) THREE AWOL SERGEANTS

Lt. Newsome is newly assigned as a Btry Exec Officer. He learns that his three senior NCOs are first rate, experienced men who cooperate well with him as he learns his new job. At the end of the second week, two of the sergeants go on pass while the third remains on duty. Monday morning the Lt. finds all three senior sergeants AWOL. The Btry CO is sick in quarters. At 1000 hours the sergeant who had the duty calls in to inform the Lt. that the other two sergeants had gotten drunk, wrecked their car, and were now sleeping it off in a motel. They had called in asking the Duty Sgt. to come get them and he left his post to look for them, but could not locate the motel from their directions. WHAT SHOULD THE LT. DO?

A. Have the sergeant on the phone continue trying to locate the other two sergeants, and report the two sergeants AWOL.
B. Order the sergeant to return to quarters under restriction and let the other two sergeants take care of themselves.
C. State that he will call the sergeant back after he checks with the Btry CO.
D. Have the sergeant return for duty at once and let the other two sergeants take care of themselves.
E. Have the sergeant continue trying to locate the other two sergeants and give them several more hours to get back before reporting them.

OFFICER LEADERSHIP QUESTIONNAIRE
(FREE ANSWER FORM)

INSTRUCTIONS: Here are some problems occurring in military life. Read them thoughtfully. On the answer sheet, in the space below the problem title, list the important things you considered in deciding how to deal with the problem, describe what you would do in each case, and describe what effects your actions will have.

If more space is needed, use the back of the answer sheets and show the problem numbers to distinguish each answer.

IDEAL OFFICER BEHAVIOR QUESTIONNAIRE[1]

INSTRUCTIONS: Write your name, your class number, and the date on the answer sheet. Do this now.

The following questions describe a variety of ways in which officers may behave. You are to read each statement and then fill in the space between the dotted lines on the answer sheet which best describes the behavior of the ideal Army officer.

Be sure to answer all items and see that the number of the statements in the booklet matches the number of your answer on the answer sheet.

1. He insists that he be informed on decisions made by his officers and NCOs.
   1) Always 2) Often 3) Occasionally 4) Seldom 5) Never

2. He rules with an iron hand.
   1) Always 2) Often 3) Occasionally 4) Seldom 5) Never

3. He assigns the men under him to particular tasks.
   1) Always 2) Often 3) Occasionally 4) Seldom 5) Never

4. He decides in detail what shall be done and how it shall be done.
   1) Always 2) Often 3) Occasionally 4) Seldom 5) Never

5. He sees to it that the work of the battery is organized.
   1) Always 2) Often 3) Occasionally 4) Seldom 5) Never

6. He makes sure that things are run according to schedule.
   1) Always 2) Often 3) Occasionally 4) Seldom 5) Never

7. He asks that everyone in the battery follow SOP.
   1) Always 2) Often 3) Occasionally 4) Seldom 5) Never

8. He sees to it that everyone is working up to his limits.
   1) Always 2) Often 3) Occasionally 4) Seldom 5) Never

9. He offers new approaches to problems.
   1) Always 2) Often 3) Occasionally 4) Seldom 5) Never

10. He maintains definite standards of performance.
    1) Always 2) Often 3) Occasionally 4) Seldom 5) Never

11. He stresses being ahead of other batteries on the post.
    1) A great deal 2) A fair amount 3) To some degree 4) A small amount 5) Not at all

12. He criticizes poor work.
    1) Always 2) Often 3) Occasionally 4) Seldom 5) Never

13. He speaks in a manner not to be questioned.
    1) Always 2) Often 3) Occasionally 4) Seldom 5) Never

[1]A modified form of the Hemphill Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire (see references 5, 6).

14. He makes sure his part in the battery is understood by everyone.
1) Always 2) Often 3) Occasionally 4) Seldom 5) Never

15. He lets everyone know what he expects of his men.
1) Always 2) Often 3) Occasionally 4) Seldom 5) Never

16. He does personal favors for men in the battery.
1) Often 2) Fairly often 3) Occasionally 4) Seldom 5) Very seldom

17. He makes a man feel at ease when talking with him.
1) Always 2) Often 3) Occasionally 4) Seldom 5) Never

18. He is slow to accept new ideas.
1) Always 2) Often 3) Occasionally 4) Seldom 5) Never

19. He looks out for the personal welfare of the men in the company.
1) Always 2) Often 3) Occasionally 4) Seldom 5) Never

20. He finds time to listen to men in the battery.
1) Always 2) Often 3) Occasionally 4) Seldom 5) Never

21. He puts suggestions by members of the battery into operation.
1) Always 2) Often 3) Occasionally 4) Seldom 5) Never

22. He "rides" the man who makes a mistake.
1) Often 2) Fairly often 3) Occasionally 4) Seldom 5) Very seldom

23. He acts without talking things over with the men under him.
1) Often 2) Fairly often 3) Occasionally 4) Seldom 5) Never

24. He deals with the men under him without thinking of their feelings.
1) Always 2) Often 3) Occasionally 4) Seldom 5) Never

25. He tells a man when he does a good job.
1) Always 2) Often 3) Occasionally 4) Seldom 5) Never

26. He refuses to explain his actions.
1) Often 2) Fairly often 3) Occasionally 4) Seldom 5) Never

27. He treats the officers and cadre as his equal.
1) Always 2) Often 3) Occasionally 4) Seldom 5) Never

28. He does little things to make it pleasant to be in the battery.
1) Always 2) Often 3) Occasionally 4) Seldom 5) Never

29. He is friendly and can be easily approached.
1) Always 2) Often 3) Occasionally 4) Seldom 5) Never

Check Your Answer Sheet to Make Sure
That All Questions Are Answered

STUDENT JUDGMENT FORM

INSTRUCTIONS: An important part of a leader's job is to judge others accurately. Frequently he is required to make recommendations concerning promotions of subordinates on the basis of his judgments. In designating responsibility, he must select the officer best qualified to handle the job. In order to assess your ability to judge others, you are asked to judge the other members of this class on the basis of observations you have made of them since you have known them. There are ten spaces provided below. In the first space write the name of the student whom you think will be the best all around officer. In the next space write the name of the student whom you think will be the next best all around officer. In the third space write the name of the student whom you think will be the third best officer. Continue in this fashion until you have listed ten students.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

This study was done in close collaboration with the leadership instructional staff and members of the OCS staff at The Artillery School, Fort Sill, Okla. Their participation in the study was a substantial contribution to the research effort.